

from my home town. And there were a lot of questions, they wanted to discuss it. That is what we really get with the Peace Corps.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

GOVERNMENT 101

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, a good friend of mine Dave Reed from Savannah, Georgia sent me an article which he entitled Democracy and Government 101. It was an article written by Cecil Hodges, also from Savannah, Georgia who is a friend of mine and pastor of Bible Baptist.

He talks in the article about the size of government and basically what happens when government gets too big. I am going to read parts of this article, Mr. Speaker:

When government is strong, especially when it is centralized, it poses a real threat to its citizens who are liable to many abuses. Every democracy faces the tendency of government demanding more and more taxes because some of its citizens are seeking ever-increasing benefits of the state.

I thought this was a very telling article. It goes on to say that a great portion of the manpower in the country becomes employed in governmental services. This becomes a problem because when the government seeks to establish a strong bureaucracy, it has to support itself. And of course, we know in this congress that the way it supports itself is by requiring the citizens through confiscatory policies to pay more and more taxes.

Then it says: All people living in a democratic society must be aware that the more government provides, the more they take from the producing citizens, and the more they control and exercise over the people. And in fact the article goes on, Dr. Hodges points out to us that eventually it enslaves its people.

This is a problem that we are faced with in our government today. This is one of the things that I am so proud of, the current freshman class, the 73 new Republican freshmen who have come in here to cut down on the size of government because they cannot do that without cutting down on the bureaucracy.

Just to give you an idea, most people always say, I hate to see the land all going away. The size of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, I know you probably will be shocked to learn; the Federal Government owns, listen to this number, 726,686,000 acres of land in the United States of America. The Federal Government, not mentioning the state and local government, owns 32 percent of the land in America.

Now, what does that mean? Of course it needs the taxes to support the services required on that land, people who

have to take care of it. What does it also mean? It means 32 percent of the land cannot be owned by the private sector. Therefore, to pay for the upkeep of that land and all the other governmental services, we are only working with 68 percent. But actually it is less than 68 percent when you take out the state and the locally owned land.

Two hundred seventy million acres is managed by the Bureau of Land Management. This is the size, Mr. Speaker, of California, Oregon, Washington, and Arizona. And about half of the 270 million acres is severely restricted for environmental reasons, and the public cannot even go on it.

You may remember the story last year of a Boy Scout troop that was hiking in the wilderness area and one 12-year-old got lost on the trail. And the Boy Scout troop started looking for him and could not find him. Finally they called out all the correct authorities, and he was located by helicopter. They found the 12-year-old boy by helicopter. They spotted him and then they called, I believe it was the Park Service, Mr. Speaker. They said: We need permission to land because this is a motorized vehicle, and this is a public land that restricts motorized vehicles. And sure enough the jar-headed bureaucrats said no, you cannot do it.

How would you like to be that 12-year-old. How would you like to be the parents of that 12-year-old? They told the kid to wait where he was, that they would try to locate him on foot. Eventually they figured out they could not find him on foot. They did give permission for the helicopter to land. But what an absurd notion that we have. But that is what happens when the government owns too many things, when the government gets too big for practical and common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I bring that up just to further illustrate the story of what Dave Reed called, Dr. Hodges' article, Government and Democracy 101.

Government gets too big, our own freedoms pay the price.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE

(By Cecil Hodges)

When government is strong, especially when it is centralized, it poses a real threat to its citizens, who are liable to many abuses.

Every democracy faces the tendency of government demanding more and more taxes because some of its citizens seek ever-increasing benefits from the State.

For three hundred years a nation was governed by Judges. They brought chaos to this nation. The people demanded a king. They were warned to be prepared for dangers inherent in government under sinful men. Three hazards to a strong centralized authority were given.

They were warned that a king would conscript their sons for military service. He would appoint leaders and engage workers to render civil service to him and his organization of bureaucrats.

Thus a great portion of the manpower of the country would be employed in governmental service. This has been one of the

problems of every society when government seeks to establish a strong, self-serving bureaucratic organization.

They were also warned that in order to pay for an ever-increasing bureaucratic organization, they would pay more and more taxes.

All people living in a democratic society must be aware that the more government provides, the more they take from producing citizens and the more control they exercise over the people.

Whenever the State increases its control over the nation's economy, enlarging its staff of officials and workers, and exacts an ever-growing portion of the nation's wealth through taxation, it becomes a monster which no longer serves the people but enslaves them.

The great privileges of a free people must be safeguarded by every citizen's commitment to and participation in government that maintains law and order, administers economic justice, prevents oppression of the weak, and resists the temptation to serve its own ends.

All Americans should ask themselves, "Is the government here for us or are we here for the government?" Our government should be of the people and for the people.

TRIBUTE TO SHARON PORTMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a community activist whose passing has left a void in the lives of our many friends at the New Jersey shore and in the lives of many other people who did not know her personally but who have been touched in one way or another by her good work.

Sharon Portman of Ocean Township, New Jersey died last week at the age of 54 after a two-year battle with cancer. She was one of the most caring members of our community in Monmouth County. Sharon received much praise and honor for her many years of kind and generous contributions to both the Jewish community and the community at large.

Back in September of 1993, on the occasion of the historic signing of the peace accord between Israel and the Palestinians on the White House lawn, I brought Sharon as my guest. She had dedicated so much of her time and energy to working for a strong and secure Israel. She believed passionately that one day Israel would achieve peace with her Arab neighbors, and she recognized that the best way to accomplish this goal was to build a State of Israel that remained true to the values of Jewish teaching and a democratic political system process, while maintaining the ability to resist military invasion and terrorism.

When the PLO leadership finally decided to give up its relentless hostility against Israel and work for mutual recognition and peace, the view that Sharon Portman had always supported and worked for was finally vindicated.

Sharon Portman was a lot of things to a lot of people. She was a staunch environmentalist and advocate for the

disadvantaged, a women's rights advocate, a friend of animals, and a businesswoman, as well as a wife and mother. I knew her best because of her love of politics. She exemplified for me that motto that we often see on bumper stickers that says, think globally, act locally.

She commented incessantly on international and national issues, but she understood that the best way she could influence public policy was by working in New Jersey for candidates and causes in which she believed. But Sharon did not just work herself. She had an incredible ability to get others involved.

At her funeral service last Sunday, I was talking about politics with a group of people and one person said that he had little interest in running for office. If Sharon were present, she would have talked to that man and encouraged him to participate for the future of his local community, for the state and for the country. She would know how to get him involved.

Sharon was above all a friend to me and everyone else that she could help in difficult times. She suffered for two years from a brain tumor, and she refused to give up. She wanted to help others who were afflicted by the same disorder.

Last summer my father-in-law was diagnosed with brain cancer, and every time I spoke to Sharon she asked me about him and wanted to help. She suggested literature, hospitals, methods of treatment, and just general information on how our family could deal with the problem and all this while she suffered so much herself.

Sharon Portman will be remembered by me and others for a long time because she served as such a wonderful example of what helping others is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TOWNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE FIRST 6 MONTHS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I stayed late tonight to tell the American people that we have come a long way in the first 6 months of this new Congress. We came here realizing that this nation was \$4.8 trillion in debt, \$19,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States of America. For a family of five like mine, the nation faces a \$95,000 debt. In our district, the income, the average income is about \$32,000 a year and to do nothing but pay the interest on that federal debt, the families in my district will be saddled with the payment of over \$6,000 a year, \$6,000 a year out of a \$32,000 average household income going to do nothing but pay the interest on the federal debt.

We came here, the 104th Congress, realizing that something had to be done about it. And after 6 months, I am happy to tell you that something has started. We have a long way to go but we have taken a lot of steps in the right direction.

First, we have passed a seven-year balanced budget plan that at least is going to stop the continued growth of this debt that seems to be endless when we start looking at it and how big the numbers are. Although we have passed that, we have done some other things that I think are equally significant. We have talked about budgets that go even further than the seven-year plan.

Out of my office we introduced a plan that would have balanced the budget in five years, and for the first time out here in Washington we started talking about paying off the debt. Our plan included a repayment plan so that in a 30-year period of time we could have repaid the entire federal debt.

It did a third thing as we produced this plan on the floor of the House about 3 months ago, our first 6 months in office. For the first time we did not use the Social Security surplus as part of the computations to balance the budget. That is a significant step forward for this country.

Our plan would have balanced the budget in five years, paid off the debt in 30 years, and not used the Social Security trust fund to do it. It is important the American people understand that the Social Security system every year collects more money in taxes than what it pays back out to our senior citizens in benefits and those extra monies that are selected should be set aside and our budget plan would have done just that.

In addition to the budget plans that were debated here, we also had introduced by my good friend from New York a plan that actually would have balanced the budget in five years. The specific cuts were laid out item for item that would have gotten us to a balanced budget in a five-year period of

time. This bill is still pending in the House of Representatives and still may pass during this term of Congress. It is my hope and my desire that we see our way clear to actually passing those cuts that get us to a balanced budget in five years instead of seven.

The best news of all is that the people that are here right now in this Congress realize that government cannot keep doing for people what people ought to be doing for themselves. It is with that note that I would conclude this evening. We have got a great start, folks. We have a long ways to go. I am happy to tell you that the first 6 months have been successful, and I look forward to continued successes here in this Congress.

DRUG INTERDICTION STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

NOVEMBER'S ELECTION

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight basically to commend something that has happened in this House, and that was the election that took place back in November, because you know it brought 73 new Republican faces to this Congress that have literally changed this Congress.

I can recall last year, the year before, the year before that, when very few of us even talked about a balanced budget. The real problem facing this Nation being the national deficit that is literally turning this country into a sea of red ink and is threatening our children and our grandchildren.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, when I look at what has happened now, when we brought the budgets to the floor of this Congress, all the alternatives this year were with a balanced budget. Even the liberals were forced to come on this floor and offer a balanced budget. Theirs decimated the defense budget, it ruined our foreign policy. Nevertheless, every vote that was taken was on a balanced budget. Now we even have the President of the United States talking about doing it sometime into the next century, which is not satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, what we were debating was this. Here is a 1,700-page document that is a legislative encyclopedia containing more than 500 specific spending reform proposals, as the gentleman from Wisconsin, MARK NEUMANN, has spoken to earlier. It contains more than \$900 billion in budget savings over 5 years, itemized program by program in a format that is so easily transformed into other individual bills or amendments.

The bill is not intended to be used in total but as a resource document that